DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 388 736 UD 030 661

AUTHOR	Slavin, Robert E.; And Others
TITLE	Scaling Up: Lessons Learned in the Dissemination of Success for All.
INSTITUTION	Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk, Baltimore, MD.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.; Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.
PUB DATE	Dec 94
CONTRACT	R117R90002
NOTE	43p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Early Intervention; *Educational Change; Elementary Education; *Information Dissemination; Language Arts; Models; National Programs; Poverty; Prevention; *Professional Development; *Program Implementation; Reading Instruction; School Restructuring; *Urban Schools; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	*Large Scale Programs; Program Replication; *Success for All Program

ABSTRACT

By describing what has been learned in disseminating Success for All, a reform program for high-poverty elementary schools, this paper explores how a national approach to professional development might enable professional development networks to implement proven school change models. Success for All restructures the elementary school by emphasizing prevention; early intervention; use of innovative reading, writing, and language arts curricula; and extensive professional development. Research in 17 schools in 7 districts has shown the positive effects of Success for All on increasing reading achievement, reducing retentions, improving attendance, and reducing special education placements. Examining its dissemination from its first appearance in one Baltimore (Maryland) school in 1987-88 through its expansion to about 200 schools nationwide in 1994-95 demonstrates the necessity of a skilled staff of trainers to work with schools. Mentoring and apprenticeships for teachers are among the strategies that make dissemination successful. Participating network schools and the central training staff are the keys to scaling up the Success for All program. (Contains 1 table and 14 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 388 736

SCALING UP: LESSONS LEARNED IN THE DISSEMINATION OF SUCCESS FOR ALL

Robert E. Slavin
Lawrence J. Dolan
Nancy A. Madden

Center for Research on the Education of Student Placed at Risk
Johns Hopkins University

December, 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This research was supported by grants from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education (No. R117R90002) and from the Carnegie Corporation and Pew Charitable Trusts. However, any opinions expressed reflect those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of our founders.

We would like to thank Steven Ross, Lana Smith, and Marcie Dianda for their comments on an earlier draft.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 030661

Never in the history of American education has the potential for fundamental reform been as great. The bipartisan embrace of ambitious national goals, the passage of Goals 2000, the reauthorization and substantial restructuring of Chapter I (now Title I), the movement away from norm-referenced standardized tests toward performance tests, the availability of new designs for school change supported by the New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC) and the Annenberg Grants, and the growing strength of such national professional development networks as Sizer's Coalition for Essential Schools, Comer's School Development Project, Reading Recovery, and the National Writing Project, are all developments that create unprecedented possibilities for change.

However, it is by no means certain that the potential for reform will be realized. Changes will take place, but will these changes actually make a difference in the school success of large numbers of children? For this to happen, the nearly three million teachers in America's schools will have to learn and regularly apply very different and far more effective instructional methods than those they use now. School organization, assessment, grouping, and many other aspects of schooling will have to change. The systemic changes happening at many levels of government are creating a fast-rising demand for high quality, sustained professional development, particularly the professional development needed for schools to adopt proven models of school change. Yet the national infrastructure for professional development of this kind is quite limited.

If reform is to produce results, major changes in the structure of professional development are needed. This paper is intended to shed light on the question of how a national approach to professional development might enable professional development networks to bring proven school change models to scale by describing the lessons we have learned in disseminating Success for All, a comprehensive reform program for high-poverty elementary schools. In the course of disseminating Success for All we have learned a great deal about the process of change, about factors that support and inhibit school-level reform, and about ways of enlisting

others in support of our efforts. This paper describes our experience with dissemination, the strategies we are pursuing, the relative success of various dissemination routes, and the implications of our experiences for public policies.

Success For All

Success for All (Slavin et al., 1992, 1994; Madden et al., 1993) is a program designed to comprehensively restructure elementary schools serving many children placed at risk of school failure. It emphasizes prevention, early intervention, use of innovative reading, writing and language arts curriculum, and extensive professional development to help schools start children with success and then build on that foundation throughout the elementary grades. Table 1 summarizes the main elements of the program.

Table 1 here

Research comparing Success for All to control schools in 17 schools in seven districts has consistently shown that Success for All has substantial positive effects on student reading achievement throughout the elementary grades (Slavin et al., 1994; Madden et al., 1993) as well as reducing special education placements and retentions and improving attendance (Slavin et al., 1992).

Success for All was first piloted in one Baltimore elementary school in the 1987-88 school year. In 1988-89 it was expanded to a total of five schools in Baltimore and one in Philadelphia. Since then the number of schools has roughly doubled each year; in 1994-95,

Success for All is being implemented in approximately 200 schools in 59 districts in 20 states throughout the U.S.

Program Characteristics Affecting Dissemination

There are several unique characteristics of Success for All that have an important bearing on the strategies we use in disseminating the program. First, while Success for All is always adapted to the needs and resources of each school using it, there are definite elements common to all. A fully functional Success for All school will always implement our kindergarten program and reading program in grades 1-5 or 1-6, will have at least one tutor for first graders, and will have a full-time facilitator and a family support team. Other elements, such as preschool and full-day kindergarten, are optional, and schools vary in the number of tutors, the staff time devoted to family support, and other features. Yet despite this variation, we believe that the integrity of the program must be maintained if schools are to produce the results we have found so consistently in our research. The whole school must make a free and informed choice to adopt Success for All; we require a vote by secret ballot of at least 80%. But when schools make this choice they are choosing a particular model of reading instruction, a particular use of Chapter I and special education resources, a particular within-school support structure, and so on. Unlike many alternative school-wide change models, Success for All is not reinvented from scratch for each school staff.

Success for All requires substantial change in many aspects of curriculum and instruction. It takes time for teachers to learn and perfect new forms of instruction, and for facilitators, tutors, family support team members, and principals to learn new roles. Therefore, the program requires a great deal of professional development done over an extended period of time. While the initial training period is only three days for classroom teachers, many follow-up visits from Johns Hopkins or other Success for All trainers take place each year. Schools budget

for 20 person-days of training in the first implementation year, ten in the second, and five in each subsequent year.

Success for All requires that schools invest in tutors, a facilitator, materials and extensive professional development. Because of the focus of the program and its cost, the program is primarily used in high-poverty schools with substantial Chapter I resources (usually at least $100,000). Success for All schools rarely receive funds beyond their usual Chapter I allocations, so in one sense the program has no incremental costs, but there are many schools that could not afford a credible version of the model. While the cost of the program does restrict its use, it also has an important benefit: it increases the likelihood that the school and district will take it seriously and work to see that their investment pays off.

The comprehensiveness, complexity, and cost of Success for All have important consequences for dissemination. First, they mean that the program cannot be mandated en masse; instead, districts start with a few schools and gradually add more. Second, they mean that the commitment to the program must be long-term, and we must be prepared to be engaged with schools for many years, perhaps forever. Third, they mean that we must maintain a large, very highly skilled staff of trainers to work with schools. While we do use teachers and facilitators from successful schools in our training programs, the program does not lend itself to an easy "trainer-of-trainers" strategy in which a small staff trains local trainers to work with schools.

Dissemination Staff

The dissemination of Success for All is primarily carried out by our staff at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk, Johns Hopkins University. At Johns Hopkins we have a full-time dissemination staff of 12 trainers, directed by three researchers (the authors of this report) who are engaged in other research, development, and policy analysis in

addition to directing the dissemination program. Almost all of our trainers are teachers; most have been building facilitators and teachers in Success for All schools. The only trainers who are not former teachers are two who focus on family support. Their backgrounds are in social work.

Although most of our trainers are located in Baltimore, we have one full-time trainer who lives in Montgomery, Alabama. Another full-time Hopkins employee is located in El Paso, Texas. She is primarily a researcher, but is also involved in dissemination to bilingual schools nationwide. In addition, we have part-time trainers (some of whom have formerly worked for us) located in various parts of the country, and we will often ask an especially talented teacher or facilitator to help us with training and follow-up in their own area. All told, there are about ten people not on the Hopkins payroll who provide from five to twenty days of training or follow-up help for us outside of their own districts. These part-timers are rarely lead contacts for schools and almost always work as part of a team with Johns Hopkins trainers.

In addition to Johns Hopkins staff, there are also two regional training programs for Success for All. The furthest advanced of these is at the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) in Los Alamitos, California (see Dianda & Flaherty, 1994). SWRL is a non-profit research and development agency that primarily serves California, Arizona, and Nevada. Staff at SWRL carry out all of the awareness, training, and follow-up functions performed elsewhere by Johns Hopkins staff. The director of the SWRL Success for All training site, Marcella Dianda, is also conducting research on Success for All in bilingual and English as a Second Language settings. Like our Johns Hopkins group, SWRL often involves selected teachers and facilitators within its region to help new schools adopt the program. In many cases, Johns Hopkins and SWRL staff work together, although SWRL is the lead contact with new schools in its region. SWRL is currently working with schools in Riverside, Clear Lake, Bakersfield, and Red Bluff, California and schools in the Phoenix area and the Navajo reservation in Arizona.

The other currently functional regional training site is at the University of Memphis. This group, led by Steven Ross and Lana Smith, has had a long-standing involvement with Success for All schools in Memphis, and has conducted research on Success for All in four districts around the U.S. More recently, the University of Memphis group has taken responsibility for implementing Success for All in Nashville and Henry County, Tennessee (and in ever-increasing numbers of schools in Memphis).

Dissemination Strategies

Schools first become aware of Success for All in a variety of ways. Many articles have been written about the program in educational journals, and our staff has made many presentations at conferences, especially Chapter I conferences. We have an awareness video and materials, including a book describing the program and its outcomes. Educators may write for information, call members of our dissemination staff, or otherwise make contact with us. School or district staff may then invite our staff to make awareness presentations. These often take place as part of "effective methods fairs" in which large districts or states invite principals or school teams to learn about many promising models. We encourage schools to send delegations to visit other Success for All schools in their region if at all possible. If there is interest in the district or schools after these awareness presentations, our staff will visit the district to work out financial and training arrangements and to negotiate a "contract" specifying what we and the district promise to do. The contract is not legally binding, but makes our intentions and requirements clear. At some point a presentation will be made to the whole staff of each interested school. Following opportunities to examine materials, visit other schools, and discuss among themselves, school staffs vote by secret ballot. As noted earlier, we require a positive vote of at least 80% of the professional staff. It is rare that we would go through the entire process and then have a vote of less than 80%; more often votes are closer to 100% positive. However, the exercise is

essential in that it assures teachers that they had a free choice and that the program is supported by the great majority of their colleagues.

As soon as a school has decided to adopt the program, planning for implementation begins. A member of the Johns Hopkins staff or one of our regional training sites is appointed to serve as the school's lead contact. If the school contracts with a regional training site, the lead contact will be from Johns Hopkins or elsewhere.

A facilitator is then chosen, usually an experienced and respected teacher from within the school's own staff. The facilitator (and often the principal as well) will attend a week-long training session in Baltimore, held well in advance of training for the school staff. For example, we hold our main facilitator training in April for schools planning their training for teachers in August. This gives the facilitators and principals plenty of time to work out issues of staffing space, finances, ordering and storing materials, and so on. Facilitators may also visit other schools to see the program in action and to get a first-hand view of what facilitators are expected to do.

If a school is planning to begin Success for All in September, training will generally take place over a three-day period in August. Additional training is provided later for tutors, family support staff, and others.

Some schools start at mid-year, implementing portions of the program that can be started then, but holding off the first grade reading program until the following September.

The initial training is typically done by the school's lead contact, other staff from Johns Hopkins or regional training staff, and (increasingly) trainers who are facilitators or teachers in

existing Success for All schools. After initial training, follow-up visits will be conducted by these same staff and by others, such as family support staff.

Our main objective during follow-up visits is to strengthen the skills of the building facilitators. We cannot hope to adequately monitor and refine implementations from a great distance; instead, we must rely on the facilitator, who is the change agent within the school, as well as the principal and teachers. Our staff members jointly conduct an implementation review, visiting classes, interviewing teachers, family support members, tutors, and others, and looking together at the data on student performance, pacing, attendance, special education placements, and so on. Our trainers model ways of giving feedback to teachers, give the building facilitators advice on solving their problems, share perspectives on strengths and weaknesses of the program, and plan with the building facilitator the goals for individual teachers and for general program implementation that the facilitator will follow up on. Trainers meet with teachers to provide additional training on such issues as writing, pacing, or classroom management. They respond to questions and discuss issues needing further attention. Later, trainers write up site reports summarizing what they have seen, noting promises made, issues to be followed up on, and ratings of the quality of implementation of each program element.

In general, we are very satisfied with the dissemination model we are using. In regular implementation checks that are part of our follow-up visits, we find more than 90% of teachers in the grades implementing Success for All curricula to be doing an adequate job of implementing the programs, and many teachers are doing inspired teaching, using our materials and methods as a jumping-off point for innovative and exciting instruction. The relative prescriptiveness of the model and the training and follow-up that support it are sometimes perceived to be problematic before implementation begins, but are hardly ever a long-term problem as teachers and other staff come to see the flexibility within the program and to see the outcomes for children. In fact, fort teachers used to inadequate professional development without the material or

human supports necessary to change their teaching on a day-to-day basis, the completeness of Success for All, from materials to maintenance, is a major plus. The consistent positive findings in evaluations of Success for All in its dissemination sites tell us that our model of dissemination is working.

However, while we are confident that the Success for All program can be successfully adapted to local circumstances and replicated nationally using the model of dissemination we have evolved, the problem we face is how to provide such an intensive level of service on a broad scale. America has more than 50,000 Chapter I elementary schools. We are currently working in about 200, or four-tenths of one percent. To have the program successfully operating in as many as 5% of Chapter I schools (2,500 schools), we must learn how to scale up our own operation substantially and to engage others in helping us to help schools.

Extending our Reach

As Success for All has become a national program, we have had to confront the problem of providing adequate training and follow-up in many widely dispersed locations with very different needs, resources, and circumstances. Early on, we began searching for ways of engaging regionally based educators in training or support roles, to extend our training capacity, reduce travel costs for schools, and to provide schools with trainers who are more familiar with the local scene than we could be. For a program as complex as Success for All, with such extensive requirements for training and follow-up, it is not a simple matter to train trainers to work in their own areas. As we disseminate Success for All we do not want to compromise on the quality or integrity of the model we have developed and researched. It is difficult to train educators who have not been teachers or facilitators in Success for All schools, and the need for lengthy follow-up makes it difficult to have part-time trainers with other jobs play a major role in training. With these concerns in mind, however, we have pursued a variety of strategies for

building a local and regional capacity for training, follow-up, and support. The following sections discuss our experiences with each of these.

Regional Training Sites

As noted earlier, we have two regional training sites for Success for All, one at the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) and one at the University of Memphis. Each of these is working well and is making an important contribution to our dissemination efforts. The stories of how these sites were established and how other attempts to create regional training sites have failed provide an interesting perspective on the possibilities and difficulties of regional training strategies.

SWRL is a non-profit research and development agency. Its mission is to address challenges facing educators in Arizona, California, and Nevada as a consequence of rapidly changing demographics and increasing numbers of academically at-risk students. SWRL's regional training center is supported in part from a subcontract from Far West Laboratory (FWL) and fees charged districts implementing SFA. FWL is one of ten regional education laboratories funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in the U.S. Department of Education.

The regional laboratories would appear to be ideal organizations to become regional training sites for Success for All. They are responsible for helping districts in their regions learn about and implement effective programs. In fact, when they were first established in the 1960's, labs were meant to complement the work of national research centers, such as the one at Johns Hopkins in which Success for All was developed and researched. As originally conceived, research centers were designed to do basic and applied research on important educational problems, while labs were supposed to interpret this research for their regions and help local

schools apply the findings. Labs and centers are funded by the same agency and are still expected to work together.

In fact, lab-center collaboration is relatively uncommon, and it is almost unheard of for labs to actively disseminate programs developed and researched in research centers. Labs often develop (and disseminate) their own programs and see little advantage in disseminating others' work. Also, labs must serve an enormous region, and it is difficult for them to provide services to individual schools. Finally, labs often find it difficult to charge for their services, as school districts are accustomed to receiving assistance for free.

Despite these problems, we have attempted to engage labs in support of Success for All dissemination. We have spoken to lab directors and lab communication directors, and have had various communications with individual labs. There was interest at one time in one lab, but even though their headquarters is near one of our largest implementations, these contacts led nowhere. Another lab also has expressed interest in developing Success for All training capacity, and this may ultimately take place. Other labs have expressed little or no interest.

The success of the SWRL regional training site is due to several factors. First, it builds on a history of prior work between Hopkins and SWRL staff. Second, SWRL's subcontract with FWL has allowed them to propose the establishment of a regional training center for Success for All and to charge districts for their services.

Another obvious candidate for regional training sites is universities. This is the route taken by several other national school reform networks, such as Reading Recovery (Pinnell, DeFord, and Lyons, 1988) and Accelerated Schools (Levin, 1987). However, Success for All does not lend itself as easily to dissemination from universities. Reading Recovery is a tutoring program for at-risk first graders that provides its training as courses with graduate credit. It therefore fits easily into established structures. Accelerated Schools emphasizes an

organizational development consulting approach that is also familiar to university faculty members (see McCarthy, 1991). In contrast, working with whole schools over extended time periods is not a usual activity for university faculty who are typically too involved with courses, committees, and research to put much time into such activities.

Our successful training site at the University of Memphis exists because of some unusual circumstances. The University of Memphis has a Center for Research in Education Policy funded primarily by the State of Tennessee. Two researchers in that Center, Steve Ross and Lana Smith, have developed a close relationship with the Memphis City Schools in the course of their research there. In 1989, they began working with one Memphis Success for All school and assessing outcomes in that school. Later, we contracted with them to conduct independent evaluations of Success for All in three additional districts, Ft. Wayne; Indiana, Montgomery, Alabama; and Caldwell, Idaho. Until recently, their main involvement with Success for All was as researchers, not trainers. However, in 1992, a new superintendent in Memphis, Gerry House, became interested in Success for All and asked their help in scaling it up. In addition, the University of Memphis center has begun work in Nashville and rural Henry County, Tennessee. They make extensive use of very able Success for All teachers from Memphis, as well as often coordinating activities with Hopkins trainers. The success of the University of Memphis regional training site depends on several relatively unique characteristics. One is the existence of a research center at the university. Another is the unusual motivation and skill of the researchers, and their close relationships both with our center and with the Memphis City Schools. However, it is important to note that the University of Memphis training site came into being through a traditional university activity, research, and not training per se. In fact, the emphasis of this center is still far more on research than on training (and the actual training is more often done by teachers than by the researchers themselves). In contrast, SWRL's regional training center focuses heavily on training and implementation support in the three-state region it serves.

State Departments of Education

One potential source of assistance in providing regionally-based training and assistance to Success for All schools is state departments of education. We have worked with a few state departments and have found them to be helpful in some ways, but have not yet found a way to have state departments play a major role in dissemination of our program.

The state department with which we have had the greatest involvement is in New Jersey. There, we worked with an Urban Education Initiative related to a state-wide court ordered plan to increase state funding to the thirty lowest-wealth districts. The state department staff involved with this initiative coordinated several meetings with high-poverty districts and intended to build its own training and support capacity for Success for All. However, the political turmoil resulting in part from the tax increases necessitated by the funding equity decision caused a change of control in the legislature and then of the governorship, dooming the Urban Education Initiative. Still, our involvement with the New Jersey State Department resulted in our building a network of schools in Elizabeth, Asbury Park, Paterson, Irvington, and Camden that has continued on its own with minimal involvement by the state.

The Ohio State Department of Education has also been very supportive of Success for All. OSDE convened two state conferences at which we presented Success for All. More recently, the Ohio Legislature approved a "venture capital" grants program in which schools could receive $25,000 to implement proven practices. Many schools applied for these funds to implement Success for All. Some were successful, and even among those that were not, some implemented the program anyway using their own Chapter I funds. The venture capital program led to an expansion of Success for All in Cleveland and new implementations in Cincinnati, Columbus, Elyria, and Dawson-Bryant. The Ohio State Department has expressed interest in building a statewide training capacity, but at present there is no plan to do so. However, a

privately funded professional development program in Cincinnati, the Mayerson Academy, is developing training and support capacity for Success for All and may ultimately take on state or regional training and support functions.

Other state departments of education, notably Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Texas have highlighted Success for All in state conferences, and the state Chapter I director has been helpful in our work in Arizona.

The most important role states play in the dissemination of Success for All is in creating a policy environment that is favorable to our work. In particular, some state Chapter I directors encourage schools to innovate, and in particular may suggest to schools whose test performance is not meeting standards that they select from among proven models. Some states communicate to schools the idea that Chapter I resources should be used as a lever for school-wide change, while others continue to focus on Chapter I as a separate program for a separate group of students. State policies promoting preventive or noncategorical uses of special education funds can also be useful in promoting Success for All.

In general, state departments of education have been important in providing appropriate policy environments, awareness, and (in Ohio), money for implementing schools, but have not taken a serious direct role in extending or supporting Success for All implementations.

District Coordinators

Many school districts with several schools implementing Success for All designate a district coordinator for the program. The district coordinator is intended to serve as a liaison between our staff, the schools, and the central administration. In some districts this person is

expected to learn the program and provide direct support to teachers, facilitators, and other staff, much like that which our staff gives to schools in follow-up visits.

Our experience with district coordinators is that they can be very useful in their liaison function, but are rarely effective in training or follow-up with schools. The need for a liaison is great, especially in large districts. District coordinators can and do help make sure that schools get the resources they need and that district policies are interpreted for the Success for All schools. For example, if the district adopts a new reading curriculum, the liaison can help figure out whether Success for All schools should simply be exempted from it, or whether some attempt should be made to adapt the Success for All curriculum to the new guidelines. The district coordinator can advocate for the program within the central office and see that it remains on the district's broader agenda. He or she can provide a single point of contact for our program staff on all issues that go beyond individual schools, from arranging for ordering, duplication, and delivery of materials, to helping with assessments, to keeping our staff aware of changes in district policies.

As important as the liaison role is, our experiences with district coordinators have been mixed. In some districts, district coordinators have been people who already have many other responsibilities, and Success for All is added to their list with nothing else being removed. Further, there is often an institutional imperative to contain, isolate, and marginalize innovations, even ones valued by the administration and clearly, demonstrably effective. Assigning a program to a relatively low ranking central office official can be one way to ensure that a project remains at the periphery of the district's operations (even if it was no one's intention that this take place). We have found that it is important to maintain close relationships with someone in the district who has line authority (such as the superintendent, assistant superintendent for instruction, or Chapter I/Title I director) and not to let the project be seen as "belonging" to a lower-level district coordinator.

We have rarely found district coordinators to be helpful in training or implementation monitoring. Most often, district coordinators do not have the time to devote many whole days to detailed, classroom-level follow-up. More importantly, most district coordinators have no experience in Success for All schools, so after a short time every teacher and administrator in the schools knows more about the program than they do. The district coordinators who have been most useful in training and follow-up have been former principals or facilitators in Success for All schools. As time goes on we expect to see district coordinators recruited from within Success for All schools able to take on much more of the training and follow-up role for Success for All than they have previously.

Regionally Based Project Staff

As the Success for All network has expanded and matured, another means of establishing regional training sites has emerged. We have begun to add to our staff trainers who are full-time employees of Johns Hopkins University but remain in their home areas. This arrangement solves several problems. First, we often find staff (usually facilitators) in Success for All schools who are outstanding educators, excellent trainers, willing to leave the security of their school district jobs, and eager to travel and work with schools all over the country, but are not willing or able to move to Baltimore. Hiring is always a problem for us; because we must pay Johns Hopkins salaries, most experienced teachers take a pay cut to work with us, receive far less vacation time, and must be willing to be on the road much of the time. We are always looking for outstanding facilitators or teachers who are eligible for retirement or looking for adventure and are deeply committed to making a difference in education on a national scale. The requirement that such unusually able and exceptional people also must be willing to move to Baltimore (if they don't already live there) puts a severe constraint on our qualified staff. Having regionally-based full-

time staff allows us to hire the very best experienced trainers regardless of where they happen to be located.

Second, hiring trainers to serve a region gives us far more control and assurance of fidelity to our program's goals than does engaging regional training sites in universities or other existing agencies, which may have their own agendas and constraints. Otherwise, regionally-based Johns Hopkins trainers have the same advantages as institutionally-based regional training sites. They reduce travel costs to local districts and know about and can adapt to local circumstances and needs.

On the other hand, regionally-based Johns Hopkins trainers also have several drawbacks. One is that they are isolated, working from their own homes without the informal collegial supports that are so important to our Baltimore staff. Operating far from our center, these trainers cannot routinely attend meetings or keep up easily with the latest information or developments. Monitoring the performance of these trainers is also problematic. While regionally-based trainers can decrease costs for the districts they serve, they increase costs for us, such as unreimbursed travel costs to bring these trainers to Baltimore for meetings, telephone costs for coordination, and costs of setting up remote offices.

As noted earlier, we currently have only one person operating full time as a regionally-based Johns Hopkins trainer. Before joining our staff in Summer, 1994, this person was an outstanding facilitator, and had already done much training for our project as a part-timer. In particular, she took substantial responsibility for training school staffs in Mobile and Fairfield, Alabama. When she decided to join our staff, she was ready to start immediately as a national trainer, as she had already worked in that role part-time.

An interesting variation on this regional training arrangement is taking shape in Houston. There, more than fifty schools are beginning to implement either the full Success for All program or the reading (or reading and tutoring) elements of the program. The lead trainer for Houston from our staff has been hired by the Houston district to work in Houston for nine months, while continuing to maintain close coordination with Johns Hopkins. She is responsible for a geographically small "region," but one with many schools involved and many more likely to become involved in the future. Another variant of the regional training approach is represented by Margarita Calderón, who is a researcher and trainer located in El Paso, Texas. Dr. Calderón has recently started as a full-time faculty member in our research center, having left the University of Texas at El Paso (although she continues to live in El Paso). She is primarily responsible for research on bilingual education but is also becoming a Success for All trainer for schools with bilingual programs. Dr. Calderón has many years of experience developing and training cooperative learning methods similar to those used in bilingual Success for All.

Despite the problems of coordination and the additional costs involved, in the future we expect to see a substantial increase in regionally-based Johns Hopkins trainers. As a practical matter, we are already hiring every experienced, qualified Success for All trainer we can who is located in the Baltimore area or is willing to move to Baltimore. This means that beyond this group we must choose between outstanding but inexperienced educators who can operate from Baltimore or equally outstanding and experienced ones who cannot. The costs and uncertainties of hiring and training inexperienced staff are at least as great as those inherent in establishing regional training sites.

If the demand for Success for All remains as high as it has been in recent years, we will need to pursue both strategies to build the capacity we will need to serve an ever-expanding network of schools with the quality, quantity, and intensity of the training we have provided on a smaller scale.

Schools Helping Schools

Perhaps the most important way Success for All is extending its reach to a larger number of schools without sacrificing quality is by increasingly engaging staffs of successful, experienced schools in training and follow-up in new schools. School staffs hardly ever take full responsibility for training and follow-up without the active involvement of trainers from Johns Hopkins or regional training sites, but they can take over some of the training and most of the follow-up. The advantages of this are significant. Local schools that have successfully implemented Success for All have staffs that know every detail of the model and how to make it work in an environment very similar to that of the new school. Experienced and new schools can establish "mentoring" relationships in which staff exchange visits, materials, and ideas. When the new school runs into troubles large or small, the mentor school is nearby and ready to help. Schools often establish local support networks to help each other implement Success for All over the long run.

Success for All schools are increasingly joining forces with each other to create local support networks. For example, experienced schools are becoming mentors for new schools just starting out in Success for All. In some places schools are helping schools within their own districts. For example, Fannin Elementary School in Wichita Falls, Texas is taking much of the responsibility for training and mentoring Austin Elementary. Schools in Modesto and Riverside, California; Aldine, Texas; Rockford, Illinois; Asbury Park, New Jersey; Miami and West Palm Beach, Florida; Memphis, and other districts have given helping hands to new schools in their districts, opening their doors to repeated visits, having school staffs visit new schools, sharing materials, coordinating training, and providing ideas, advice, and emotional support. Many schools are mentoring schools outside of their districts. Harrison and Fews Elementary Schools in Montgomery, Alabama have been helping schools in Mobile and Fairfield. Schools in

Modesto are helping schools in Red Bluff. Schools in Elizabeth and Paterson, New Jersey, have been helping schools in Irvington. Morton Elementary School in Morton, Texas helped train and mentor a new school in Muleshoe, and both are now helping schools in Tulia and O'Donnell.

In addition to experienced schools mentoring new schools, there are several areas in which staff from Success for All schools of all levels of experience meet on a regular basis to share ideas and discuss common problems. For example, facilitators and principals in different districts in Northern New Jersey and in the Phoenix, Arizona area meet from time to time to discuss ways to improve their implementations of Success for All.

School-to-school mentoring lets the real experts—the teachers, facilitators, and principals in successful Success for All schools—share their wisdom of practice and hard-won experience. It gives new schools an attainable vision of what Success for All should be like. It gives staffs of new schools support when they run into problems or opposition. Mentor schools know the local situation, so they can help new schools adapt to local realities more readily than our Hopkins trainers can.

Networking among local schools implementing Success for All can produce enormous benefits to all who are involved. Staff members from different schools are able to suggest new ways of solving problems or looking at common issues. In discussing problems or opportunities they all face, visiting each other's schools, and exchanging materials and information, school staffs can give each other the most useful and productive technical assistance possible, because local Success for All schools combine knowledge about the program with knowledge about local politics, circumstances, and needs.

Perhaps most importantly, building support networks enables school staffs to provide emotional support to one another. In an isolated Success for All school, staff members are

always wondering if they're doing the right thing, if problems they perceive are temporary setbacks or serious roadblocks. Others in the district or even in the same school are often skeptical, either wondering what madness has come over the school or feeling envious about the attention and resources the school is getting. A local support network or mentoring arrangement helps school staffs withstand the inevitable pressures that come with innovation. Teachers, facilitators, and principals in Success for All schools speak a common language and share a common vision and purpose.

The following sections discuss ways in which schools help schools implement Success for All.

Mentoring. Staffs of mentor schools can play a critical role in providing local models of effective implementation that others can visit, in participating in training and follow-up, and in giving advice and support to new schools. Mentoring arrangements can significantly reduce the amount of time Johns Hopkins or regional training center facilitators need to spend at a school, and can therefore reduce the costs of implementing Success for All. However, mentoring is not intended to completely replace training and follow-up from Johns Hopkins. To maintain the integrity and effectiveness of the program we need to know that its main elements exist in high quality form in each school that calls itself a Success for All school. It is important that we achieve an appropriate balance between local mentoring and continued training and follow-up from Johns Hopkins or regional training centers (SWRL or the University of Memphis). Working out this balance is done on a case-by-case basis, but we do not anticipate having staff of new Success for All schools completely trained by local mentor schools without our involvement. To do this would risk our most important resource, our reputation for providing consistent, first rate professional development to enable high-poverty schools to substantially improve the school success for all their children. The ideal arrangement for bringing new schools into the Success for All family is a combination of initial training from Johns Hopkins or

regional training program staff in collaboration with local mentor schools followed up by the mentor school staff, with occasional visits from Johns Hopkins to add additional elements and check on the schools' progress.

Relationships between mentors and new schools can be established either formally or informally. In the Success for All network today, many mentoring relationships were established informally by the schools themselves. Usually, a delegation from a new school visited an existing school, and when the new school adopted Success for All, the relationship between the new and existing school has continued. This happens all the time within districts that are expanding their number of Success for All schools, but often happens between districts as well. For example, new schools in Nashville, Mobile, and Fairfield (AL) have all formed relationships with schools in Montgomery, Alabama. Schools in Red Bluff, California first saw Success for All in Modesto and have maintained this relationship. Schools in Bakersfield, California have maintained relationships with Success for All sites in Riverside and Modesto.

In other situations mentoring arrangements have been established as an explicit part of an implementation plan. For example, in Memphis, Modesto, Riverside, Aldine (TX), Wichita Falls (TX), Asbury Park (NJ), Rockford (IL), and Dade County (FL), new schools have been assigned existing schools, or at least designated staff from existing schools, to serve as their mentors. The participation as mentors in each of these cases was voluntary, but was strongly encouraged and supported by the districts.

The best way for new schools to obtain the "attainable vision" of what a Success for All school should look like and be able to accomplish is to arrange to have staff members from new schools visit experienced schools. Such visits are a typical and important part of the decision-making process that leads to a school's adopting Success for All, and continue to play an important role as experienced schools become mentors for new schools. In initial visits, likely

visitors are those who will be most involved in the decision: principal, members of a site-based management team, representatives of teachers and parents, and district staff. After the decision has been made, the designated facilitator is often the most frequent visitor, along with teachers who visit their counterparts in the mentor school to see what various program elements look like in practice.

Apprenticeship. Just as one-to-one tutoring is the most effective form of instruction for children, one-to-one apprenticeship is the most effective way to learn a complex task. One of the best services a mentor school can provide to a new Success for All school is to provide an opportunity for key staff from the new school to work side by side with their experienced counterparts.

Apprenticeship opportunities often involve individuals designated to be facilitators in new schools working with experienced facilitators. This is a particularly effective use of apprenticeship. The facilitator's role is extremely complex and demanding; no training program or manual could begin to describe in adequate detail the thousand tasks every facilitator must do well.

The more time a new facilitator can spend in an experienced school, the better. The new facilitator can be of concrete value to the experienced one in helping with eight-week assessments and regrouping, organizing materials and supplies, and so on, while gaining concrete information about the facilitator's role. The new facilitator can attend all the meetings the experienced facilitator attends, including those of grade level teams, family support teams, and building advisory teams. The new facilitator can also visit classrooms and tutoring sessions with the experienced facilitator so that they can compare notes afterwards on strengths and weaknesses of lessons and constructive strategies for helping teachers improve the teachers' lessons, classroom management strategies, and other practices. The new facilitator might spend

time with family support staff, going on home visits with them or participating in programs for parents. After a week or more in a mentor school, a new facilitator will be far more confident about how to make his or her own school equally effective, and will have built relationships with the mentor school staff that will be important to both schools for a long time.

After the new school is up and running, the facilitator from the mentor school might arrange to spend a day or two with the new facilitator to "shadow" him or her and provide feedback and ideas.

Apprenticeships can be equally useful for other key staff. It is rarely possible for a principal to spend a whole week in another principal's school, but several day-long visits can often be arranged and can be an excellent way to give the new principal a better vision of the whole program, knowledge of his or her own role, and a strong relationship with the mentor principal and staff. Family support team members can spend significant amounts of time in their mentor school working with its family support team, facilitator, and principal to learn how to make this program component work well. Individual teachers frequently visit teachers in the mentor school but less often apprentice with them. However, this does happen on occasion, especially when teachers are new to a Success for All school that does not yet have fully proficient teachers of its own to serve as mentors at the appropriate grade level.

Mentors as Trainers. Increasingly, facilitators, teachers, family support staff, and principals in existing Success for All schools are taking on a key role in formal training sessions for new schools. This training is almost always done in partnership with trainers from Johns Hopkins or from regional training centers at SWRL or the University of Memphis. We try to be very selective in inviting staff of experienced schools to take on formal training roles. Many people who are outstanding in implementing the program in their own schools are not effective

trainers, and we are always concerned that the program will "drift" from its experience and research base if training is provided only by experienced implementors, no matter how effective they are. However, we have identified many staff members in existing Success for All schools who are excellent trainers, and we are hoping to identify many more. Trainers from mentor schools do have many advantages. They are likely to know the local situation, and to have special legitimacy in that teachers know that they practice what they preach every day. Also, trainers from local schools often become mentors and are extremely helpful in follow-up and problem solving after the initial training period.

Mentors and Follow-up in New Schools. The most common and important role mentor schools play is in following up with new schools after the initial training period. Especially in the first months of program implementation, staffs of new Success for All schools have thousands of questions, and run into problems they did not anticipate. Johns Hopkins and regional training center facilitators are always happy to respond to such questions by telephone, and they schedule follow-up visits to schools to provide additional training, work with the facilitator and principal, and check on the school's progress. However, local mentor schools can do an outstanding job of follow-up because they are closer, more familiar with the local scene, and likely to have experienced (and solved) the same problems.

Networking

Building a national network of Success for All schools is one of the most important things we're trying to do at Johns Hopkins. An isolated school out on the frontier of innovation can sometimes hang on for a few years, but systemic and lasting change is far more likely when schools work together as part of a network in which school staff share a common vision and a common language, share ideas and technical assistance, and create an emotional connection and

support system. This is the main reason we have an annual conference for experienced and new sites. At the annual conference we provide valuable information on new developments and new ideas (most of which we have gotten directly from the schools we work with). We are also trying to build connections between the experienced schools, so that they can share ideas on issues of common interest and build significant relationships with other schools pursuing similar objectives. We are also trying to create an esprit de corps, a pride in what we are all trying to do together, an understanding and acceptance of the struggle needed to achieve the goal of success for every child. We have "t-shirt days" and team-building activities that can be as important as the formal sessions. The breaks, when staff from different schools get to know each other and exchange information and telephone numbers, may be even more important.

In addition to the national conferences, there are many other things we try to do to build an effective support network. Our newsletter, *Success Story*, is one example. Our training sessions and the manuals and materials we produce invariably use contributions from experienced Success for All schools and reflect them back to all schools. In particular, our family support and facilitator's manuals are primarily composed of ideas we've gotten from extraordinary Success for All schools, and we keep revising these and other materials as we learn more from the schools. For example, school staff often modify various materials, forms, and assessments for their own use. We pay attention to these modifications and if they seem broadly applicable, we use them to revise our materials. Further, in our conversations with schools we are constantly putting schools in touch with other schools to help them with specific issues, such as bilingual education, year-round schedules, use of Chapter 1 funds in non-schoolwide circumstances, use of special education funds to support tutoring, and so on.

Many local support networks for Success for All arise in informal ways, where individual principals or facilitators happen to be friends or get to know one another at Hopkins conferences or other activities related to Success for All. Mentoring relationships between experienced and

new schools often grow into local support networks. In other cases, local support networks have been established by school districts or (in the case of Northern New Jersey) by the state department of education.

Local Meetings. One of the most common activities of local support networks for Success for All is regular meetings among key staff. Most often it is facilitators or facilitators and principals together who meet about once a month to discuss common problems and explore ways to help each other. Sometimes principals meet separately from time to time to discuss issues of particular concern to them. Family support teams from different schools have met for many years in Baltimore, and such meetings have also occurred in other districts. The benefits of these meetings are like the benefits of mentoring, discussed earlier. Principals, facilitators, and family support team members can learn a great deal from others who are facing similar problems in similar environments under similar circumstances. Further, regular meetings among the leaders of Success for All schools provide routine opportunities for these staff to build positive relationships and to establish opportunities for other types of mutual assistance.

Some local support networks schedule some sort of demonstration at the host school for the visiting staff from other schools. For example, the host school may have developed a new computer system to help with regrouping, a new thematic unit for preschool or kindergarten, or a family involvement or parent volunteer program they want to show off. The demonstration might take place before or after the meeting.

Local Conferences. One of the problems with our national Success for All conferences is that since most school staff must travel great distances to attend, few schools send more than one or two people, usually the facilitator and/or the principal. Because of funding limitations, some schools cannot send anyone. Yet a similar purpose can be served by holding local conferences. These can be scheduled on designated staff development days so that all staff

can attend. For example, the Philadelphia Public Schools organized a local conference of this type. The activities were like those of the national conference, with various inservices, updates, and other sessions, and with opportunities for schools to show off their accomplishments in a variety of ways. Hopkins staff participated, but center stage was reserved for the schools themselves. This provided a basis for local networking among the whole staffs of the schools that has remained long after the conference itself.

Sharing Resources. There are many ways in which Success for All schools make effective use of limited resources by working together in a local support network. For example, schools often schedule combined training sessions. This does not work if numbers get too large, but if, for example, there is a training session just for kindergarten teachers or just for tutors, then it makes sense for this training to be offered to all members of a local support network.

Many schools share materials with each other. For example, schools making extensive use of novels find that they can make resources go much further if they share their novels with other Success for All schools. Two schools may agree on a common list of novels and each can then order half of the list, expecting to exchange novels at mid-year.

Schools involved in local support networks also collaborate on development of new materials. This happens frequently when a district adopts a basal or literature series for which supportive materials do not exist. The district or several individual schools often designate a development team of teachers from several schools to create these materials (using our format and standards) and then share them with all schools. We often contract to pay some of the costs of this development if we can then share the new materials with all districts using the same books.

Lessons Learned

Our experience with the national dissemination of Success for All has led us to several conclusions. These are as follows.

1. Successful dissemination of a program as comprehensive and complex as Success for All requires a combination of two types of assistance to schools. One is a core of talented, dedicated trainers operating from the project's home and/or regional training sites closely coordinated with the project headquarters. The second is a local and national network of schools willing and able to provide technical and emotional support to schools entering the network.

2. While other institutions can be helpful in dissemination (and we do have two excellent regional training programs in other institutions), we are finding greater success in employing staff from outstanding Success for All schools to be full- or part-time trainers. Regional laboratories, other universities, and state departments of education have been helpful in our dissemination efforts, but with only two exceptions they have not yet taken major responsibility for disseminating Success for All in their regions. District coordinators are very helpful as liaisons between our project, Success for All schools, and their central offices, but have been less helpful in training or follow-up. Regionally-based trainers on our payroll and staff in Success for All schools who are willing to do some training and follow-up for us are usually much more effective at supplementing our home staff.

3. Quality control is a constant concern. Whatever dissemination strategy we use, constantly checking on the quality of training, implementation, and outcomes is essential. Without it, all programs fade into nothingness.

4. To maintain over a long period of time, schools implementing innovations must be part of a national network of like-minded schools. To survive the inevitable changes of superintendents, principals, teachers, and district policies, school staffs need to feel that there is a valued and important group beyond the confines of their district that cares about and supports what they are doing.

Success for All is only one of many national models of school reform, and it has unique characteristics that may make some dissemination strategies effective and others difficult or ineffective. Other types of programs may find very different strategies to be more effective. However, to the extent that other programs emphasize a strong research base, a well-specified set of materials and procedures, and a comprehensive approach to reform, we believe that our experiences will be a useful guide and will inform policies regarding technical assistance and reform at the local, state, and federal levels.

Policy Implications

Our experiences with the dissemination of Success for All have given us some degree of insight into the ways of systemic issues, such as federal, state, and local policies, can promote or inhibit school-by-school reform, and have given us some ideas about how these policies might change to support what we and other school change networks are trying to do.

Substantial positive change in student learning can only come about on a broad scale when major changes take place in the daily interactions of teachers and students. Ideally, we would have a variety of curricula, instructional methods, professional development methods, and school organizational forms for each subject and grade level, each of which has been rigorously researched and evaluated in comparison to traditional practices and found to be effective on valid

measures of student achievement. School staffs would be made aware of these effective alternatives and would have the time and resources to learn about them, visit schools using them, see video tapes on them, and ultimately make an informed choice among them. Their exploration of alternatives might be assisted by local "brokers" who are knowledgeable about effective programs, organizational development, and the change process, and are aware of local needs, circumstances, and resources.

School staffs would control significant resources for materials and professional development and would be able to invest them in the exploration process and in well developed models supported by national training staffs and local support networks. These national programs would themselves be primarily supported by revenues from schools, but would also have seed money for developing materials and awareness and training materials, establishing national networks and regional training sites, and building qualified staffs of trainers and support personnel. Federal and state policies would support the process of school-by-school change by developing and promulgating standards, assessments, and accountability mechanisms likely to encourage school staffs to explore alternative models for change and to invest in professional development. They would push existing resources (such as Title I, Title II, and Goals 2000 funds) to the school level, with a clearly stated expectation that these funds are intended for whole-school reform, not for maintaining current operations or patching around the edges. Some portion of school change funds would be provided on a competitive basis to schools, based on their willingness to engage in whole-school reform and allocate their own resources (especially Title I) to this purpose. Further, funds would be allocated to outstanding exemplars of school reform methods to compensate them for the costs of serving as demonstration sites, mentoring other schools in their local networks, and participating in local training and follow-up.

Current realities are very far from this vision. The remainder of this paper discusses the current state of policy support for school-by-school changes and the policy reforms needed to provide this support on a broad scale.

1. Increase support for research and development of school change models.

One of the most important deficiencies in the current structure of professional development is a shortage of whole school reform programs proven in rigorous research to be markedly more effective than traditional instruction, and fewer still that are ready for national dissemination. Besides Success for All, only the Comer project has conducted and reported comparisons with traditional methods (see Becker & Hedges, 1994, for a review). Even at the classroom level, there are only a few proven, well-evaluated methods capable of national dissemination, such as Reading Recovery (Pinnell et al., 1994) and cooperative learning (Slavin, 1995). There is progress on the development of new school change models; the New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC) is funding nine design teams to develop such models, and recent Annenberg funding may help small school change networks scale up their operations. However, there is no current plan to formally evaluate the outcomes of these new designs in comparison to traditional methods. It is interesting to note that the federal involvement in the development, evaluation, and dissemination of these models has been minimal. Private foundation and corporate funding has almost entirely been responsible for the development and dissemination of the Comer, Levin, and Sizer projects. Success for All has benefited from federal funding (its development and evaluation have been part of the work of the Center for Research on the Education of Disadvantaged Students at Johns Hopkins University), but it could not have been successfully developed and evaluated without funding from the Abell, Carnegie and Pew Foundations.

There is a need for a federal investment in development of school-wide change models, in evaluation of these models by their developers, and in third-party evaluations in comparison to traditional methods (see Slavin, 1990, for more on this). Only when we have many successful models with clear and widely accepted evidence of effectiveness will we be able to confidently offer schools an array of choices each of which may be quite different in philosophy or main elements but each of which is known to be effective under well-specified and replicable conditions of implementation.

2. Help proven professional development networks build capacity.

The most important limitation on the broad dissemination of Success for All is our own capacity to provide high-quality professional development services to a very large number of schools. Our model requires a great deal of training and follow-up, and any equally ambitious restructuring program that intends to change the daily instructional practices of all teachers would require equally intense training. We can only add so many schools each year without overtaxing our staff's considerable energies or seeing the quality of professional development decline. As a result, we must decline to work with further schools whenever our training calendars are full.

Our professional development organization is self-funding; our trainers' salaries are supported by fees we charge schools for their time. However, rapid scale-up has costs. While we are training new trainers, we must pay their salaries, fly them to observe schools or training sessions, and so on. Costs for establishing trainers in sites other than the project's home site may be particularly great, as these trainers must travel frequently to the home site. There is no source of funding for these costs. By the time a trainer is fully operative and bringing in enough revenue to cover his or her salary, we may have spent more than $50,000.

There is a need to provide training organizations like ours with funds to scale up their operations. Ultimately such organizations must be self-funding, but they need capitalization as they begin their work and as they engage in significant expansion of their national capacity. As noted earlier, private foundations have largely fulfilled this capitalization function for some projects.

The U.S. Department of Education's National Diffusion Network (NDN) also provides small grants to "developer/disseminators" to help them build training capacity for programs whose effectiveness has been validated by a panel of experts (see below). However, a substantial expansion of capacity to serve thousands of schools responding to the national call for reform will require a far greater investment in existing and future training networks to build their capacity to provide quality professional development. This investment should be made in the projects themselves, in schools successfully implementing the projects that are willing to become demonstration/training sites, and in regional institutions capable of becoming qualified regional training sites for the project (see below).

3. Provide resources to schools earmarked for adoption of effective programs.

Serious reform at the school level takes serious funding at the school level. School staffs must have control of resources they can only spend on professional development, especially on adoption of demonstrably effective programs. For example, the Commission on Chapter I (1992), led by David Hornbeck, proposed a 20% set-aside of Chapter I funds for professional development. This did not prevail in the Congress; in the final Title I bill there is a set-aside of only 5% per year, only for schools not meeting test standards.

School staffs should control professional development funds so that they can choose those that they feel will meet their needs. When they freely select a given program or service

provider they will feel a commitment to that choice, quite in contrast to the more common case in which teachers resist inservice presentations they feel do not respond to their needs. A school should be able to purchase services from any provider, including universities, regional laboratories, federal, state, or local technical assistance centers, professional development networks (such as the National Writing Project), or even their own district's staff development office. Funds for this purpose may be awarded on a competitive basis; our own experience with the Venture Capital program in Ohio suggests one means of providing resources to schools with coherent plans for implementing major changes in their school and classroom programs.

4. Provide awareness and brokering services to schools so they can choose professional development services wisely.

Individual school staffs are poorly placed to select promising or effective programs, as they may not be aware of what is available or how to go about obtaining the programs and materials they need.

Providing awareness (and some brokering) of promising programs is one area in which the federal government has played a significant role. As noted earlier, the National Diffusion Network (NDN) provides small Developer/Disseminator grants to developers of programs that have met an evaluation standard. NDN state facilitators organize awareness conferences and help schools adopt these "validated" programs. However, the evaluation standards are low, and NDN funding has never been adequate to provide much more than a clearinghouse, informational function, though even with its limitations NDN efforts have led to thousands of successful adoptions of research-based programs in every state.

There is a need for far more ambitious outreach to school and district staffs to help them assess their needs and make them aware of a range of alternative programs and services available to them. Schools might invest their own professional development resources in such brokering

services, or might pool resources with other schools to bring in awareness presentations on a variety of available programs and practices. State or federal support might be important in helping establish brokering agencies or individuals, but in a system in which professional development resources are focused at the school level, agencies or individuals providing any professional development services to schools would ultimately have to support themselves on fees from schools. Existing agencies, such as the regional laboratories, the NDN state facilitators, and the new regional technical assistance centers, could also play an important role in helping schools make wise choices of professional development services and programs.

5. Provide funds to successful exemplars of proven programs to serve as demonstration/training sites.

One thing we have learned in the dissemination of Success for All is how important it is to have schools successfully implementing the program whose staffs are willing to receive visitors and assist neighboring schools in the process of adopting the program. Many of our outstanding schools have put hundreds or thousands of person-hours into helping other schools start and maintain the program.

However, all this help comes at a price. Many schools refuse to provide more than minimal assistance to other schools because they feel it is taxing on their own staff resources. Some principals are concerned that if they let their best staff members work to help other schools, they will be hired away. More often, school staffs find that while their efforts to help other schools bring them recognition and satisfaction, they must put a limit on this activity.

It is unfair and unrealistic to expect that outstanding exemplars of proven programs will work indefinitely as demonstration and training sites without any outside compensation. There is a need to provide resources to these schools for the real costs of serving as demonstration sites

(such as hiring substitutes when staff are elsewhere helping other schools) and to help them see aiding other schools as a part of their responsibilities. A model for this is professional development schools associated with schools of education.

Schools willing to serve as demonstration/training sites might receive funds amounting to half of their facilitators' salary (about $25,000). In return, they would be expected to be open to a specified number of formal visits (e.g., one visit per month) and to provide some number of person-days of training and follow-up to other schools (e.g., 40 person-days per year). This would create a situation in which schools would be motivated to serve as demonstration/training sites, and would receive special recognition (as well as funds) for agreeing to serve in this role.

Conclusion

Our experience in the national dissemination of Success for All is instructive in many ways. We have discovered that there are far more schools eager to make thoroughgoing changes in their instructional programs than we or other national training networks can possibly serve. Policy changes, such as those contained in the reauthorized Title I, Title II, Goals 2000, and state and local systemic reforms, are further motivating schools to seek high-quality, intensive, and extensive professional development services to fundamentally transform themselves. The key limitation in making this change take place is the limited national capacity to provide schools with well-researched models backed by networks of trainers, demonstration schools, materials, and other requirements.

The focus of this paper is on the ways we have tried to expand the capacity of our Success for All program to serve a rapidly expanding network of schools across the U.S., and on

the policy changes that would be needed to support our network and others in building our nation's capacity in quality professional development. In brief, we have found that our network of schools and our own dedicated staff are the bedrock of a national dissemination strategy, and that building on the strengths of this network is the most promising approach to scale-up. Federal, state, and other support to help establish and maintain professional development networks like ours, along with providing money to schools earmarked for professional development, are most likely to create conditions in which schools throughout the U.S. will focus energies on exploring alternatives, seeking professional development appropriate to their needs, and then engaging in a long-term thoughtful process of change that results in measurably improved achievement for all children.

References

Becker, B.J., and Hedges, L.V. (1992). A review of the literature of effectiveness of Comer's school development program. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University.

Commission on Chapter I (1992). Making schools work for children in poverty. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Dianda, M., & Flaherty, J. (1994). Annual report on promising practices and program a daptations and successes. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Haynes, N.M. (Ed.) (1994). School development program: Research monograph. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Levin, H.M. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. Educational Leadership, 44 (6), 19-21.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L.J., and Wasik, B.A. (1993). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. American Educational Research Journal, 30, 123-148.

McCarthy, J. (1991, April). Accelerated schools —The Satellite Center Project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., DeFord, D.E. and Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high risk first graders. Reading Research Quarterly, 29, 8-38.

Pinnell, G.S., DeFord, D.E., and Lyons, C.A. (1988). Reading Recovery: Early intervention for at-risk first graders. Arlington, VA; Educational Research Service.

Slavin, R.E. (1995). Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice (2nd Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R.E. (1990). On making a difference. Educational Researcher, 19 (3). 30-34.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., and Smith, L.J. (1994). "Whenever and wherever we choose...": The replication of Success for All. Phi Delta Kappan, 75 (8), 639-647.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., Smith, L.J. (1994, April). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., and Wasik, B.A. (1992). Success for All: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Table 1

Major Elements of Success for All

Success for All is a schoolwide program for students in grades pre-K to five which organizes resources to attempt to ensure that virtually every student will reach the third grade on time with adequate basic skills and build on this basis throughout the elementary grades, that no student will be allowed to "fall between the cracks." The main elements of the program are as follows:

1. *Tutors.* In grades 1-3, specially trained certified teachers work one-to-one with any students who are failing to keep up with their classmates in reading. Tutorial instruction is closely coordinated with regular classroom instruction. It takes place 20 minutes daily during times other than reading periods.

2. *A School-Wide Curriculum.* During reading periods, students are regrouped across age lines so that each reading class contains students all at one reading level. Use of tutors as reading teachers during reading time reduces the size of most reading classes to about 20. The reading program in grades K-1 emphasizes language and comprehension skills, sound blending, and use of shared stories that students read to one another in pairs. The shared stories combine teacher-read material with phonetically regular student material to teach decoding and comprehension in the context of meaningful, engaging stories. In grades 2-5, students use novels or basals but not workbooks. This program emphasizes cooperative learning activities built around partner reading, identification of characters, settings, problems, and problem solutions in narratives, story summarization, writing, and direct instruction in reading comprehension skills. At all levels, students are required to read books of their own choice for twenty minutes at home each evening. Classroom libraries of trade books are provided for this purpose. Beginning in the second year of implementation, cooperative learning programs in writing/language arts are introduced in grades K-5.

3. *Preschool and Kindergarten.* The preschool and kindergarten programs in Success for All emphasize language development, readiness, and self-concept. Preschools and kindergartens use thematic units, Peabody Language Development Kits, and a program called Story Telling and Retelling (STaR).

4. *Eight-Week Assessments.* Students in grades K-3 are assessed every eight weeks to determine whether they are making adequate progress in reading. This information is used to suggest alternate teaching strategies in the regular classroom, changes in reading group placement, provision of tutoring services, or other means of meeting students' needs.

5. *Family Support Team.* A family support team works in each school to help support parents in ensuring the success of their children, focusing on parent education, parent involvement, attendance, and student behavior. This team is composed of existing or additional staff such as parent liaisons, social workers, counselors, and vice principals.

6. *Facilitator.* A program facilitator works with teachers to help them implement the reading program, manages the eight week assessments, assists the family support team, makes sure that all staff are communicating with each other, and helps the staff as a whole make certain that every child is making adequate progress.